

REMARKS

Claims 40-41 and 43-50 are pending in the Application and are now presented for examination. Claims 1-39 and 42 have been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 40 and 41 have been amended to more clearly recite what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 43-50 have been added and are also presented for consideration. Support for new Claims 43-50 may be found at least at ¶¶ [0015], [0059], [0068]-[0069], [0076]-[0078] and [0089]-[0090]. No new matter has been added.

Claims 40 and 41 are independent.

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claim 41 is rejected on the grounds of certain informalities including that the preamble to the claims begins with “A computer program comprising...” which, according to the Office Action, makes the claim appear to be directed to the non-statutory program itself rather than the statutory storage medium. Examiner suggests merely striking the words “A computer program comprising” to overcome this objection. Additionally, “pseudo” in line 4 appears to be a typographical error. Applicant has herein amended Claim 41 to conform to the Examiner’s suggestions. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by International Patent Publication No.: WO 02/51051, to Lorch, et al. (hereinafter “Lorch”).

Independent Claim 40

Applicant has hereby amended Claim 40 to more clearly recite features included in the

user profile. Specifically, Claim 40 has been amended to recite the feature in which the user profile includes “a franking profile including a method of payment for a mail object; a naming profile including name and address information for an associated user; a dynamic mail function profile including a listing of the one or more mail services associated with the pseudo name; and a designated time frame for which the user profile is active.” The features of the user profile recited in Claim 40 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Lorch.

The Office Action characterizes Lorch as teaching “a system for routing a mail object in a postal service to a designated person, the system comprising: means for registering a pseudo name and providing instructions for one or more mail services in a user profile associated with the pseudo name, the user profile having a designated time frame for which the user profile is active; means for determining a registered pseudo name to locate the user profile associated with the registered pseudo name; and means for executing the instructions for the one or mail services during the designated active time frame in the user profile.” The Office Action apparently equates the proxy address disclosed by Lorch as being equivalent to the pseudo name, the user profile or both, as recited in Claim 40. However, it is unclear as to which item the Office Action intends the proxy address to correlate.

Regardless, Applicant has herein amended Claim 40 to more clearly recite features included in the user profile. Specifically, as amended, Claim 40 recites that the user profile includes a franking profile, a naming profile, and a dynamic mail function profile. The franking profile includes method of payment for the mail object. The naming profile includes name and address information for the associated user. The dynamic mail function profile includes instructions for one or more mail services associated with the pseudo name. Lorch does not

disclose a user profile which includes a franking profile or a dynamic mail function profile. As Lorch does not disclose each and every element of Claim 40, as amended, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of amended Claim 40.

Independent Claim 41

Applicant has hereby amended Claim 41 to more clearly recite the features of the user profile, in a manner similar as that discussed above in relation to Claim 40. Specifically, Claim 41 has been amended to recite the feature in which the user profile includes “a franking profile including a method of payment for a mail object; a naming profile including name and address information for an associated user; and a dynamic mail function profile including a listing of the one or more mail services associated with the pseudo name.” The arguments presented above in relation to Claim 40 apply equally to Claim 41. As the features of the user profile recited in Claim 41 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Lorch, Applicant earnestly solicits reconsideration of Claim 41.

New Claims 43-50 are each dependent either directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 40 and 41 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 40-41 and 43-50 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 090457.

Date: February 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Alan M. Weisberg/
Alan M. Weisberg
Reg. No.: 43,982
Attorney for Applicant
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 68786
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122
email: ptomail@cwiplaw.com

99471